

REMARKS

I. Introduction

The present Response does not amend, add, or cancel any claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-10 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 are independent.

II. Interview

Applicants would like thank Examiner Brutus for the courtesy and cooperation extended during the interview conducted December 20, 2010. During the interview, Applicants discussed the independent claims to clarify the manner in which the subject matter recited therein was disclosed in the Specification. Specifically, Applicants indicated that the sign of the velocity signal was described in the Specification and identified such passages. The Examiner agreed that the claimed features regarding the sign code of the velocity signal were supported by the specification.

III. Office Action Summary

In the Office Action of August 20, 2010, claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claims 2 and 6, and are also rejected for the same reason. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's indication that claims 1 and 5 are allowed, is noted with appreciation.

IV. Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Regarding this rejection, the Office Action indicates that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The Office Action specifically indicates that the limitation "velocity signal includes a sign code to distinguish between a transmission direction of the pulse waves and an opposite direction to the transmission" is not supported by the Specification.

As discussed during the interview, the Specification does clarify the meaning of the sign code of the velocity signal. In particular, the Specification provides support for a negative value corresponding to a velocity in a direction which is moving away, while a positive sign corresponds to a velocity in a direction that is approaching. See paragraphs [0003] and [0004] of the published application. These directions can, for example, correspond to a transmit direction and an opposite direction thereof. Accordingly, this disclosure is believed to provide sufficient support for the limitation of a sign code for the velocity signal.

Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is believed in order, and courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any matters which can be resolved by way of either a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

AUTHORIZATION

Applicants request any shortage or excess in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, and for which no other form of payment is offered, be charged or credited to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 520.46163X00).

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP.

/Leonid D. Thenor/
Leonid D. Thenor
Registration No. 39,397

LDT/vvr
1300 N. Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-312-6600
Fax: 703-312-6666

Dated: December 20, 2010